

Application No. 10/665,532
Reply to Office Action dated March 18, 2008

Docket No.: 1381-0302P

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-4 and 6-13 are currently being prosecuted. Claims 7 and 11 have been withdrawn from consideration. By this Amendment, claimas 1, 6, 8-10 and 13 are amended, No new matter is involved. Support for the Amendments is found throughout Applicantrts' originally filed Application, including the drawings, e.g., Figs. 3 and 4, and the portion of the specification describing the drawings. The Examiner is also respectfully requested to reconsider the withdrawal of claims 7 and 11, and the outstanding rejections of record in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

Election of Species

Should the Examiner find that claims 1 and 6, as amended, are allowable, then the Examiner is requested to examine on the merits, and allow, withdrawn, dependent claim 11, which depends from claim 1, and withdrawn claim 7, which depends from claim 6, Applicants being entitled under 37 CFR §1.141(a) to claims to a reasonable number of species recited in claims that depend from an allowable generic claim.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Itagaki (JP 59-164450). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 6 and 13 have been amended to recite a combination of features that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Itagaki.

Application No. 10/665,532
Reply to Office Action dated March 18, 2008

Docket No.: 1381-0302P

As amended, claim 1 positively recites a combination of features, including at least one rope pulley provided with rope grooves having a predetermined depth and a cross section having an upper portion with a predetermined radius of curvature and a lower portion with a different radius of curvature, the at least one rope pulley being a traction sheave coated with a layer of material increasing the coefficient of friction, the coating layer being located in the upper portion of the grooves with the predetermined radius of curvature to form an auxiliary grooving space without a coating between a bottom of the coating layer and the lower portion of the groove with the different radius of curvature, said traction sheave being driven by a drive machine to move the hoisting rope set, wherein in the auxiliary grooving space and the shape of the auxiliary grooving space provide an increased coefficient of friction between the hoisting rope and the rope grooves relative to that provided by a pulley groove without the predetermined shape of the auxiliary grooving that allows the hoisting rope to bite into the traction sheave after the coating on the surface of the traction sheave has been lost wherein the elevator is usable when the coating on the surface of the traction sheave has been lost.

As amended, claim 6 positively recites a subcombination of features similar to that recited in the combination of claim 1.

As amended, claim 13 recites a combination of features, including rope grooves rope grooves having a predetermined depth and a cross section having an upper portion, and a lower portion with a predetermined radius of curvature, for hoisting ropes on an outer rim thereof and a coating increasing friction against the hoisting ropes, the coating layer being located in the upper portion of the grooves to form an auxiliary grooving space without a coating between a bottom of the coating layer and the lower portion of the groove with the predetermined radius of

Application No. 10/665,532
Reply to Office Action dated March 18, 2008

Docket No.: 1381-0302P

curvature, wherein the material used in the traction sheave in the auxiliary grooving space and the shape of the auxiliary grooving space provide an increased coefficient of friction between the hoisting rope and the rope grooves relative to that provided by a pulley groove without the predetermined shape of the auxiliary grooving when the coating has been lost.

Itagaki does not disclose or suggest the claimed auxiliary grooving features, which are without a coating material. In Itagaki, all grooves in the traction sheave 2B are filled with a coating material. Moreover, Itagaki contains no disclosure whatsoever of the claimed auxiliary groove shape feature.

Claims 2-4, 8-10 and 12 depend from allowable independent claims 1 or 6 and, as such, are also considered to be allowable. In addition, these claims recite other features that make them additionally allowable. This includes the materials of the coating, the size of the rope, the material of the ropes, some of the shapes of the grooves and the insert beneath the coating on the sheave. Accordingly Applicants, submit that these claims are additionally allowable.

Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10 and 13 patentably define over Itagaki.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10 and 13 are respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Itagaki in view of Piech et al ("Piech" -U.S. Patent 6,267,205). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants, submit that even if Piech et al. describes a rope having this diameter, these claims remain allowable based on their dependency from allowable claim 1.

Application No. 10/665,532
Reply to Office Action dated March 18, 2008

Docket No.: 1381-0302P

Accordingly, claims 3 and 12 patentably define over Itagaki in view of Piech.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of claims 3 and 12 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all pending claims should be examined on their merits, and that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner either alone or in combination. In view of this, reconsideration of the withdrawal of claims 7 and 11 from consideration, and of the rejections of record, and allowance of all of the claims are respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application; the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert J. Webster, Reg. No. 46,472 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Application No. 10/665,532
Reply to Office Action dated March 18, 2008

Docket No.: 1381-0302P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: June 18, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By

Paul C. Lewis

Registration No.: 43,368

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant